



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/393,405	09/10/1999	CHRISTOPHER J. HOWARD	003936.P001X	2647

21127 7590 03/24/2004

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
ONE STATE STREET
SUITE 800
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/393,405

Applicant(s)

HOWARD ET AL.

Examiner

Pierre E. Elisca

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-43, 62-64, 78-80 and 95-110 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-43, 62-64, 78-80 and 95-110 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed 12/15/2003.
2. Claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80 and 95-110 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, and 95-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dykes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,915) in view of Maddalozzo et al. (U.S. pat. No. 6,460,060).

As per claims 24-36, 40, 62-64, and 78-80, Dykes substantially discloses a computer system/method for providing security checking for software applications accessed via the WWW (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that a method for controlling access to information presented by a web browser executing on a local computer system connected to a computer network), comprising:

presenting content within a browser window of the web browser (**see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of presenting content or object within a browser window of the web browser**); and disabling at the local computer system or on the client digital processing system a disallowed user function when the content is within the browser window (**see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of disabling and disallowed user function**).

It is to be noted that Dykes fails to explicitly disclose Applicant's newly added limitation wherein said downloaded content from a source to the web browser. Maddalozzo discloses a Web browser having search capabilities, automatically generates a search list of websites wherein client computer downloading Web page and searching the content of said downloaded Web page (downloaded web page or bookmark) utilizing said at least one user-input search parameter or software (**see., abstract, col 1, lines 17-67, col 2, lines 37-55, col 4, lines 17-60, col 9, lines 1-9**). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the software applications of Dykes by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Maddalozzo because this would restrict unauthorized downloading content access.

As per claims 37-39, 41, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the content comprises user perceivable information in a hyper-text markup language (HTML) format (**see., col 5, lines 10-27, col 8, lines 16-29**).

As per claims 42, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the content comprises user perceivable information in a common gateway interface (CGI) language format (see., fig 4, element 420).

As per claim 43, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the content comprises user perceivable information in a JAVA language format (see., col 8, lines 16-29).

As per claims 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, and 110, Dykes discloses a computer system/method for providing security checking for software applications accessed via the WWW (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that viewer program operatively connect able to a source of content, the viewer program having a plurality of functions related to presenting the content from the source), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving content from the source (see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, figs 2-4, specifically wherein it is stated that data stream may be presented to web server application....., please the web server is receiving content from the client workstation);
receiving function authorization data indicating which of the viewer functions may be performed at the local computer system on the content from the source (see., abstract, figs 2-4, col 4, lines 33-67, col 5, lines 1-62, col 9, lines 7-65, gateway or authorization);

presenting the content with the viewer program (**abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of presenting content or object with the viewer program or within a browser window of the web browser**);

disabling at the local computer system selected viewer functions in accordance with the function authorization data received from the source (**see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of disabling viewer or user function**).

As per claim 96, 99, 102, 106, and 108, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the disabled viewer functions are selected from the group consisting of print, page set-up, save, save as, view source, save picture as, set as wallpaper, copy, screen capture, print screen and cut functions (see., col 4, lines 47-57, please note the NETSCAPE is capable of doing the limitations above such as print, page set-up, save, save as, view source, save picture as, set as wallpaper, copy, screen capture, print screen and cut functions).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/15/2003 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground (s) of rejection. Necessitated by amendment filed on 12/15/2003.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 703 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703 305-9769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Pierre Eddy Elisca

Primary Patent Examiner

March 17, 2004